

1
2
3
4

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 DAVID LITMON, JR., No. C-10-3894 EMC
9 Plaintiff,

10 v.

11 EDMUND G. BROWN, Attorney General of
California, *et al.*,
12 Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR COURT TO RESCIND
ORDER**

16 Plaintiff David Litmon, Jr. has moved the Court to rescind its order of September 12, 2011,
17 in which it granted Defendants' motion to strike the first amended complaint. According to Mr.
18 Litmon, the order should be rescinded because it incorrectly stated that he did not file an opposition
19 to the motion.

20 Mr. Litmon is correct that he filed an opposition. However, that opposition was not timely
21 filed. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-3(a) (providing that an opposition must be filed and served not more than 14
22 days after the motion is filed and served). In any event, the Court has now considered the arguments
23 made by Mr. Litmon in his opposition and finds none of them availing. For example, Mr. Litmon
24 claims that Governor Brown signed and/or authorized California Penal Code § 290.012; however,
25 that does not mean that the governor is responsible for its enforcement. Also, Mr. Litmon does not
26 address in his opposition the basis on which other persons allegedly similarly situated received
27 preferential treatment. Finally, contrary to what Mr. Litmon asserts, the arguments made by
28 Defendants are entirely appropriate for consideration at the Rule 12(b)(6) phase rather than on

1 summary judgment. Only if a plaintiff pleads a facially plausible claim may he or she be permitted
2 to proceed with the case.

3 Finally, the Court notes that Mr. Litmon has not been prejudiced to the extent that, in its
4 September 12 order, the Court gave him an opportunity to file a second amended complaint which
5 he has now done.

6 To the extent Mr. Litmon has asked for alternative relief – *i.e.*, that the September 12 order
7 be amended to reflect that he did an opposition – the Court notes that its order here renders that
8 relief moot. The Court acknowledges that Mr. Litmon did file an opposition but, as noted above, the
9 opposition was not timely filed.

10 This order disposes of Docket No. 50.

11

12

IT IS SO ORDERED.

13

14

Dated: October 14, 2011

15

16


EDWARD M. CHEN
United States District Judge

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID LITMON, JR.,
Plaintiff.

No. C-10-3894 EMC

10
11
12
13

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, Attorney General of California, *et al.*, Defendants.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

16 I, the undersigned, hereby certify that I am an employee in the U.S. District Court, Northern
17 District of California. On the below date, I served a true and correct copy of the attached, by placing
18 said copy/copies in a postage-paid envelope addressed to the person(s) listed below, by depositing
19 said envelope in the U.S. Mail; or by placing said copy/copies into an inter-office delivery
20 receptacle located in the Office of the Clerk.

DAVID LITMON, JR.
32314 Ruth Court
Union City, CA 94587

23 | Dated: October 14, 2011

RICHARD W. WIEKING, CLERK

24
25
26
27
28

By: _____ /s/ Leni Doyle
Leni Doyle
Deputy Clerk